



THE UNIVERSITY *of* EDINBURGH

Edinburgh Research Explorer

History, temporality, and the interdynastic experience

Citation for published version:

McDowall, S 2019, 'History, temporality, and the interdynastic experience: Yu Binshuo's survey of Nanjing (ca. 1672)', *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies*, vol. 78, no. 2, pp. 307-338.
<https://doi.org/10.1353/jas.2018.0026>

Digital Object Identifier (DOI):

[10.1353/jas.2018.0026](https://doi.org/10.1353/jas.2018.0026)

Link:

[Link to publication record in Edinburgh Research Explorer](#)

Document Version:

Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

Published In:

Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies

General rights

Copyright for the publications made accessible via the Edinburgh Research Explorer is retained by the author(s) and / or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing these publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

Take down policy

The University of Edinburgh has made every reasonable effort to ensure that Edinburgh Research Explorer content complies with UK legislation. If you believe that the public display of this file breaches copyright please contact openaccess@ed.ac.uk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.



History, Temporality, and the Interdynastic Experience:

Yu Binshuo's Survey of Nanjing (ca. 1672)

STEPHEN MCDOWALL 馬蒂文
University of Edinburgh

THE CALAMITOUS EVENTS of the *jiashen* 甲申 year (1644) and their traumatic aftermath, eventually culminating in the complete capitulation of the Ming dynasty, precipitated a profound and prolonged cultural transition that lingered long after memories of the military takeover had begun to fade. As suggested by the term “remnant subject” (*yimin* 遺民)—the traditional designation for one who had grown to maturity under a previous dynasty and maintained loyalty to it—dynastic transition brought a heightened awareness of the

ABSTRACT: In this article, I examine the place of second-generation “remnant subjects” in the struggle to reconstruct Han literati collective identity following the traumatic Ming–Qing transition. The work of one such figure—Yu Binshuo (d. 1722), son of the better-known Yu Huai (1616–1696)—can be read as a response to inherited cultural trauma. Temporally removed from the Ming past, Yu’s *Survey of the Ancient Sites of Jinling* presents a subtly different kind of engagement with Ming cultural heritage than works of the eye-witness generation, yet Yu’s reimagining of Nanjing’s spatial order represents a discursive coping strategy that attempts to reclaim subjectivity in a time of loss. Understanding that loss as cultural trauma—a threat to both past and future identity—helps us to make sense of people’s experience of the extended cultural transition from Ming to Qing, as well as the operation and transmission of trauma more generally.

摘要：本文通過探究余賓碩寫的《金陵覽古》，對第二代遺民在清初社會的影響做了重新思索。雖然甲申之變時余氏尚幼，但他寫的六十首懷古詩表現了他對於明朝的深切懷想。作者認為，余氏所關注的是明朝的歷史記憶，及明代古跡在南京史上的地位。

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS: This article has benefited greatly from the judicious comments of the editors and several reviewers, particularly those of Chuck Wooldridge, for which I am extremely grateful.

temporal, perhaps even a “suspension of dynastic time” in Jonathan Hay’s thoughtful analysis.¹

A profound sense of belatedness characterizes the later years of the artist and poet Chen Hongshou 陳洪綬 (1599–1652), who adopted the sobriquets Huichi 悔遲 (repentant too late) and Laochi 老遲 (old and too late) after 1645, while Huang Zhouxing 黃周星 (1611–1680) considered himself to have “stolen life” (*tousheng* 偷生) by delaying the suicide that should properly have occurred after the Manchu conquest.² The shock of 1644 left its mark on the traditional sexagenary (*ganzhi* 干支) cycle, a calendar that theoretically transcended political affairs, and the *jiashen* year remained culturally resonant enough in 1704 for Leng Shimei 冷士嵎 (1628–1710) to mark the first cyclical anniversary of the conquest in writing.³ Adherence to pre-Qing methods of marking time became an important symbol of resistance that extended beyond both the life of the Southern Ming courts and China’s physical borders: timekeeping by reference to a Ming past rather than a Qing present continued in Chosŏn Korea well into the eighteenth century.⁴

The temporal separation alone of some of these responses from the military events of 1644 suggests that an understanding of the longer, collective, cultural response to the fall of the Ming requires a broadening of the range of potential witnesses, beyond those who we might expect to have been directly affected by the events themselves. A certain preoccupation with the temporal is also evident in the literature produced during the first few decades of Qing rule, and many of the nostalgic reflections, memories, reminiscences, and dreams of a Ming past recorded during the second half of the seventeenth century represent some of the most compelling writings of the late imperial period. But nostalgia for the fallen Ming became, particularly in

¹ Jonathan Hay, “The Suspension of Dynastic Time,” in *Boundaries in China*, ed. John Hay (London: Reaktion Books, 1994), pp. 171–97.

² *Eminent Chinese of the Ch’ing Period (1644–1912)*, ed. Arthur W. Hummel, 2 vols. (Washington, DC: United States Government Printing Office, 1943–1944), v. 1, p. 87; Ellen Widmer, “Between Worlds: Huang Zhouxing’s Imaginary Garden,” in *Trauma and Transcendence in Early Qing Literature*, ed. Wilt L. Idema, Wai-yee Li, and Ellen Widmer (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Asia Center, 2006), pp. 249–81.

³ Wai-yee Li, introduction to *Trauma and Transcendence*, p. 1.

⁴ JaHyun Kim Haboush, “Contesting Chinese Time, Nationalizing Temporal Space: Temporal Inscription in Late Chosŏn Korea,” in *Time, Temporality, and Imperial Transition: East Asia from Ming to Qing*, ed. Lynn A. Struve (Honolulu: University of Hawai’i Press, 2005), pp. 115–41.

the Jiangnan region, so imbedded within late seventeenth-century culture that its expression cannot necessarily be equated with Ming loyalism, a term that has generally been used more exclusively for someone who "pointedly altered his or her life patterns and goals to demonstrate unalterable personal identification with the fallen order."⁵

Although loyalists and their supporters have traditionally sought to create very clear divisions between the categories of loyalist and collaborator, the range of choices available to men and women in the wake of dynastic transition was usually far more complex than such binaries allow.⁶ In this world, it was possible to express a sense of nostalgia for the Ming without taking on a remnant subject or loyalist role or, indeed, without having been alive under the Ming. It was also, of course, possible to change one's mind, or act inconsistently: Zhu Yizun 朱彝尊 (1629–1709), for example, who had initially eschewed government service under the Qing, eventually relented but professed to feeling shame (*kui* 愧) at having done so.⁷ Thus, in considering the Ming–Qing transition and the attendant psychological adjustments of its various subjects, the segmentation of time by standardized dynastic dates is of far less use to us than what Lynn Struve calls "the texturing, coloring, and shaping of those segments and their joinery."⁸

Within this context, the potentially fascinating issue of what the designation "remnant subject" might have signified when applied to a man who had come to maturity *after* the Manchu conquest has received little scholarly attention. This neglect is due in part to an understandable, even if not wholly unproblematic, scholarly bias toward first-generation, eyewitness remnant-subject testimony in studies of the Ming–Qing transition.⁹ But it also reflects a tendency to dismiss political loyalty expressed by subsequent generations as merely extensions of loyalty to fathers or mentors, an example being Fu Mei 傅眉 (1628–

⁵ Lynn A. Struve, "Ambivalence and Action: Some Frustrated Scholars of the K'ang-hsi Period," in *From Ming to Ch'ing: Conquest, Region, and Continuity in Seventeenth-Century China*, ed. Jonathan D. Spence and John E. Wills Jr. (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1979), p. 327.

⁶ Tobie Meyer-Fong, *Building Culture in Early Qing Yangzhou* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2003), p. 33.

⁷ Wai-yee Li, introduction to *Trauma and Transcendence*, pp. 19–20.

⁸ Struve, introduction to *Time, Temporality, and Imperial Transition*, p. 6.

⁹ Lynn A. Struve, "Confucian PTSD: Reading Trauma in a Chinese Youngster's Memoir of 1653," *History and Memory* 16.2 (2004): 14–31.

1684), the only son of the calligrapher Fu Shan 傅山 (1607–1684). Pan Lei's 潘耒 (1646–1708) eventual acceptance of office—following his participation in the invitation-only *boxue hongci* 博學鴻詞 (Broad scholarship and vast erudition) examination of 1679—was interpreted at the time as a failure of loyalty to his teacher Xu Fang 徐枋 (1622–1694), even though Pan was born a Qing subject.¹⁰ Willard J. Peterson argues that such men should be excluded from the category of Ming loyalist, “since filial piety rather than loyalty to a ruling house was the primary justification for abstention from the Qing government.”¹¹ This view, however, fails to take seriously the choices of a small minority of such men to maintain remnant-subject identities while so many others of their generation—who also had fathers—did not. In fact, no clear consensus emerged over the course of the seventeenth century as to whether loyalty to the Ming *should* be hereditary, and Xu Jie's 徐介 (1627–1698) stated concern that his (and others') descendants be spared the status of “hereditary remnant subject” (*shixi yimin* 世襲遺民) suggests that we should not dismiss so easily those of the second generation who consciously selected a Ming loyalist path.¹²

The concept of cultural trauma provides an alternative, and potentially more productive, reading of the extended transition from Ming to Qing and of the place of different actors and generations within that transition than our inherited Confucian ideals of loyalty have hitherto allowed. Developed by sociologists over the past two decades, the theory of cultural trauma pays serious attention to the cultural, discursive practices that help to shape, texture, and extend the experience of trauma for different actors and potentially for extended periods of time. Several studies have convincingly demonstrated the regeneration and transmission of trauma to subsequent generations in diverse social and cultural contexts: Akiko Hashimoto's work on the Japanese post-war experience, for example, and John Hughson and Ramón Spaaij's study of second-generation Liverpool football supporters following the fatal human crush at Hillsborough Stadium in 1989.¹³

¹⁰ Wai-ye Li, introduction to *Trauma and Transcendence*, pp. 19–20.

¹¹ Willard J. Peterson, “The Life of Ku Yen-wu (1613–1682),” pt. 1, *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 28 (1968): 144, doi: 10.2307/2718597 (romanization altered).

¹² Zhao Yuan 趙園, *Ming Qing zhi ji shidafu yanjiu* 明清之际士大夫研究 (Beijing: Beijing daxue chubanshe, 1991), p. 384.

¹³ Akiko Hashimoto, *The Long Defeat: Cultural Trauma, Memory, and Identity in Japan* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015); John Hughson and Ramón Spaaij, “You Are

In some contexts, the passing of time seems to have been crucial to the ways in which particular traumas have been experienced. The Nanjing Massacre of 1937, virtually absent from public consciousness for several decades after the event, is increasingly promoted as an event of profound national significance in the People's Republic of China today. We might be tempted to regard the trauma experienced by this new generation of Chinese as somehow artificial or too politically motivated to be real, but we are generally less hasty to deny twenty-first-century Jewish communities the right to commemorate and interpret the atrocities of World War II on their own terms merely because they had not directly experienced the concentration camps. At issue in both cases is the forging of a collective identity through the memory of a traumatic event, and these examples demonstrate why cultural trauma has been defined as a "meaning struggle, where individual and collective actors attempt to define a situation by imposing a particular interpretation on it."¹⁴

It is not my intention to compare the levels of pain and suffering particular individuals or groups experienced over the Ming–Qing transition. I doubt that there is much to be gained in assigning such values or in claiming that one particular event was more or less traumatic than another. Rather, I want to view the transition period as *differently* traumatic for different actors and to take a closer look at *how* that trauma manifested itself in the lives and works of those who did not experience the conflict firsthand. In his seminal article on the concept, Piotr Sztompka defines the most salient type of cultural trauma as "an identity crisis and the struggle to reestablish, reshape, or construct anew a collective identity."¹⁵ I argue that this is precisely the kind of struggle we see taking place among Han literati during the early decades of the Qing period, a struggle in which the disenfranchised postconquest generations clearly had a stake.

One such figure is Yu Binshuo 余賓碩 (zi Hongke 字鴻客, hao Shionong 號石農; d. 1722), a native of Fengting 楓亭 in Putian County, and

Always on Our Mind': The Hillsborough Tragedy as Cultural Trauma," *Acta Sociologica* 54.3 (2011): 283–95.

¹⁴ Ron Eyerman, "Intellectuals and Cultural Trauma," *European Journal of Social Theory* 14.4 (2011): 456.

¹⁵ Piotr Sztompka, "Cultural Trauma: The Other Face of Social Change," *European Journal of Social Theory* 3.4 (2000): 459.

son of the well-known remnant subject Yu Huai 余懷 (1616–1696).¹⁶ Few of Binshuo's biographical details have been passed down to us, and his precise date of birth remains obscure, but as his father was just 30 *sui* 歲 when Nanjing surrendered to Manchu forces in June 1645, Binshuo must have come of age under Qing rule.¹⁷ The *Jiangnan tongzhi* 江南通志 (Comprehensive gazetteer of Jiangnan) of 1737 records that both Binshuo and his father made their names by means of their literary talents (*cihan* 詞翰), and those scraps of information we can gather together from various disparate sources paint a picture of a young man very much immersed in the late seventeenth-century remnant world.¹⁸

Yu Binshuo's social circles included Qu Dajun 屈大均 (1630–1696) and Chen Gongyin 陳恭尹 (1631–1700), both of whom had been associated with anti-Qing resistance under Zhu Youlang 朱由榔 (Prince of Gui 桂王; 1623–1662), the last significant remnant Ming court leader.¹⁹ Binshuo exchanged poems with Dong Yue 董說 (1620–1686), who had responded to the Manchu takeover by taking monastic orders in the 1650s, and Binshuo is named in a group that visited Gong Xian's 龔賢 (ca. 1619–1689) Half-Acre Garden (Banmu yuan 半畝園), in a poem by Zhuo Erkan 卓爾堪 (b. 1653) that is included in the compilation *Yimin shi* 遺民詩 (Poems of remnant subjects).²⁰ Zha Shenxing 查慎

¹⁶ I use 1722 as the date of Yu Binshuo's death following Deng Zhicheng 鄧之誠, *Qing-shi jishi chubian* 清詩紀事初編, 8 *juan* 卷 in 2 vols. (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1965), v. 1, j. 2, pp. 287–88.

¹⁷ Shan Jinheng 单锦珩 gives a birthdate of 1665, but it cannot be correct; “Li Yu jiao-you kao” 李漁交游考, in *Li Yu quanji* 李漁全集, 20 vols. (Hangzhou: Zhejiang guji chubanshe, 1992), v. 19, p. 161. A more likely suggestion of before 1640 is posited by Kozuka Yoshihiro 小塚由博, “Yo Kai kazoku kô: Yo Hinseki to Yo Ranseki o chûshin ni” 余懷家族考: 余賓碩と余蘭碩を中心に, *Daitô bunka daigaku Chûgokugaku ronshû* 大東文化大學中國學論集 21 (2004): 7.

¹⁸ *Jiangnan tongzhi*, comp. Huang Zhijun 黃之雋, 200 *juan*; Yingyin Wenyuange Siku quanshu edition (Taipei: Taiwan shangwu yinshuguan, 1983–1986) [hereafter all Siku quanshu editions are referred to as “SKQS edition”], j. 172, p. 8a; *Shangyuan xian zhi* 上元縣志, ed. Chen Shi 陳枋 et al., 24 *juan* plus 1 suppl. in 5 vols. (Taipei: Chengwen chubanshe, 1983), v. 4, j. 20A, p. 29a.

¹⁹ Qu Dajun, “Chong zhi Baimen su Yu Hongke shantang zuo” 重至白門宿余鴻客山堂作, in *juan 7 of Wengshan shiwai* 翁山詩外, in *Qu Dajun quanji* 屈大均全集, ed. Ou Chu 歐初 and Wang Guichen 王貴忱, 8 vols. (Beijing: Renmin wenxue chubanshe, 1996), v. 1, pp. 426–27; Chen Gongyin, “Zeng Yu Hongke” 贈余鴻客, in *Dulutang shiji* 獨漉堂詩集, in vol. 1413 of *Xuxiu Siku quanshu* (Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 1995–2002), j. 3, pp. 5b–6a. Qu stayed at Yu Binshuo's house on a visit to Nanjing in 1669; Li Jintang 李金堂, “Yu Huai nianpu” 余懷年譜, in *Yu Huai quanji* 余懷全集, ed. Li Jintang, 2 vols. (Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 2011), v. 2, p. 730.

²⁰ Dong Yue, “Zhuhihe Yu Hongke shou chunxue zhong yuanzeng zhi zuo” 追和余鴻客

行 (1650–1727)—another postconquest generation writer who seems to have shared Ming loyalist sympathies—was Binshuo's guest when Zha passed through Nanjing in 1679.²¹ Kong Shangren 孔尚任 (1648–1718) describes Binshuo as wearing the simple bamboo hat of a remnant subject (*yimin li* 遺民笠) in a poem of 1689.²² Kong himself was born under Qing rule, but his famous drama *Taohua shan* 桃花扇 (Peach blossom fan) of 1699, based on events that took place in Nanjing between 1643 and 1645, gives a sense of the lingering afterlife of the Ming for those of his social circle, whether or not they chose to appropriate a remnant-subject sensibility. Yu Binshuo is named as part of a group that gathered to view the play at Kong's Beijing residence during the winter of 1700.²³

In this article, I focus on one text that I argue is part of the meaning struggle resulting from the trauma of the extended Ming–Qing transition: Yu Binshuo's *Jinling langu* 金陵覽古 (A survey of the ancient sites of Jinling), a sixty-part record of the city of Nanjing.²⁴ The tour

首春雪中遠贈之作, in *Baoyun shiji* 寶雲詩集, 7 *juan*, in vol. 122 of *Congshu jicheng xubian* (Shanghai: Shanghai shudian, 1994), j. 2, pp. 4a–b; Zhao Hongjuan 趙紅娟, *Ming yimin Dong Yue yanjiu* 明遺民董說研究 (Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 2006), p. 127; Lu Yongqiang 陸勇強, “Dong Yue jiaoyou bukao” 董說交游補考, *Ming Qing xiaoshuo yanjiu* 明清小說研究, no. 2 (2003): p. 151; Zhuo Erkan, “Tong Yu Hongke, Zhou Xueke, Zhu Linxiu, Cai Zhiqian, Xuansheng guo Gong Banqian Banmuyuan kan hua you gan” 同余鴻客周雪客朱林修蔡芝泉鉉升過龔半千半畝園看花有感, in *Ming yimin shi* 明遺民詩, comp. Zhuo Erkan, 16 *juan* (Shanghai: Zhonghua shuju, 1961), j. 16, p. 706. Yu Huai's poems are spuriously attributed to Yang Zhuo 楊燾 in *Ming yimin shi* (j. 3, pp. 121–27).

²¹ Li Jintang, “Yu Huai nianpu,” p. 733; Zha Shenxing, “Ti Yu Hongke Jinling langu ji” 題余鴻客金陵覽古集, in *Jingyetang shiji* 敬業堂詩集, 50 *juan*; SKQS edition, j. 1, p. 8a. Zha's attitude is evinced in a satirical poem that mocks Qian Qianyi's 錢謙益 (1582–1664) failure of loyalty to the Ming; Kang-i Sun Chang, “Qian Qianyi and His Place in History,” in *Trauma and Transcendence*, p. 202.

²² Kong Shangren, “Guo Yu Hongke zhai” 過余鴻客宅 in *Kong Shangren quanji jijiao zhuping* 孔尚任全集輯校註評, ed. Xu Zhengui 徐振貴, 4 vols. (Jinan: Qilu shushe, 2004), v. 2, p. 1057.

²³ Kong Shangren, “Gengchen renri xueji Antang shibi fenyun” 庚辰人日雪霽岸堂試筆分韻, in *Kong Shangren quanji*, v. 3, pp. 1619–20. Yu Binshuo may have been in Beijing for much of that year, based on his contributions (dated 1700) to a three-*juan* gazetteer, *Chijian Hongci guangjisi xinzhì* 勅建弘慈廣濟寺新志, compiled by the monk Zhanyou 湛祐 and published in 1704. References to Yu Binshuo occur throughout Kong Shangren's collected works; *Kong Shangren quanji*, v. 2, pp. 1063–64, and v. 3, pp. 1398–99, 1452–53, 1458–59, 1531–33, 1627–28, 1641, 1647–49, and 1816.

²⁴ Yu Binshuo, *Jinling langu*, 1 *juan*, in *Jiukuang bianyu*, *Jinling langu*, *Yusheng jilüe* 救狂砭語/金陵覽古/餘生記略 (Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 1983). Subsequent page references in the main text are to this edition, which is a reprint of the Kangxi-era Wanyu shanfang 萬玉山房 edition, signed by the Nanjing publisher Fan Hanbo 范翰伯 (fl. late seventeenth century). An alternative 1850 edition in 4 *juan*, which includes harmonizing

of Nanjing described in the *Jinling langu* is dated the *bingwu* 丙午 year (1666) within the text (p. 2a), and although the survey itself is undated, it must have been completed by 1672, given that it includes a preface by Zhou Lianggong 周亮工 (1612–1672), who died in that year.²⁵ These dates are significant, as they place both the tour and the publication of the text beyond the deaths (in 1662) of both Zhu Youlang and the Ming loyalist commander Zheng Chenggong 鄭成功 (1624–1662), and with them, for all but a staunch few, the effective dissipation of any lingering hopes of a Ming restoration.²⁶ In formal terms, the written text of the *Jinling langu* follows the itinerary of the tour, with the “ancient sites” from various different ages of Nanjing’s past appearing as they would have to a seventeenth-century tourist: that is, they are spatially rather than chronologically arranged (although some of these sites are no longer visible). At each of sixty locations, Yu reflects in heptasyllabic-regulated verse (*qiyan lüshi* 七言律詩) on a site or sight, with a prose essay preceding each poem. The essays vary greatly in length, sometimes helping to elucidate the poems and sometimes treating an entirely distinct theme.

Although the literary content of the *Jinling langu* would clearly repay more extensive analysis, my principal concerns here are to place Yu’s survey within a context of inherited cultural trauma and to point to the potential significance of this and other such works as windows into the Ming–Qing transition. Ostensibly a survey of Nanjing, I argue that the text is better understood as addressing the fate and future legacy of the Ming dynasty itself and, by extension, Yu Binshuo’s own place in the new world order. Temporally removed from the Ming past,

poems by two Yongzheng-era scholars, Wang Yuan 王瑗 (fl. early eighteenth century) and Wang Guan 王琯 (fl. early eighteenth century), is reprinted in Yu Binshuo, *Jinling langu*, 4 *juan* (Yangzhou: Jiangsu Guangling guji keyinshe, 1990). These two versions display considerable textual variance, some but not all of which is identified in the simplified *Nanjing xijian wenxian congkan* 南京稀見文獻叢刊 edition: Yu Binshuo, *Jinling langu*, ed. Cheng Lin 成林 (Nanjing: Nanjing chubanshe, 2009). For clarity, I generally use the name “Nanjing” 南京 over the various others by which the city was known in different eras; for these names, see David B. Honey, “Before Dragons Coiled and Tigers Crouched: Early Nanjing in History and Poetry,” *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 115.1 (1995): 15–16.

²⁵ Li Jintang does indeed give 1672 as the publication date but cites no evidence for this date; see his “Yu Huai nianpu,” p. 731. Zhou’s preface also appears in his *Laigutang ji* 賴古堂集, 24 *juan* in 2 vols. (Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 1979), v. 2, j. 15, pp. 11a–12b. The Yangzhou version of Zhou’s preface (p. 5a) gives its date as the fifteenth year of the Kangxi reign (1676), which cannot be correct.

²⁶ Lynn A. Struve, *The Southern Ming, 1644–1662* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1984).

the *Jinling langu* presents a subtly different kind of engagement with Ming cultural heritage than works of the eyewitness generation, yet I argue that Yu Binshuo's reimagining of Nanjing's spatial order, and his adoption of the role of ill-fated but duty-bound historian, demands that it too must be read as an attempt to "reclaim subjectivity in a time of loss," a preoccupation Grace Fong identifies in the elder generations of remnant subjects.²⁷ Understanding that loss as cultural trauma—a threat to both past and future identity—helps us to make sense of the extended cultural transition from Ming to Qing as it was experienced by various men and women in China and beyond.

The Language of Trauma: Autumn Lament in Nanjing

Dynastic transition was not a seventeenth-century peculiarity. By the time Manchu forces entered Nanjing in 1645, there already existed a rich literary tradition surrounding the lost splendors of fallen capitals, and seventeenth-century writers were able to draw on a veritable storehouse of preexisting cultural codes and images to tell their stories. Particularly resonant for those living through the period were Meng Yuanlao's 孟元老 (fl. 1110–1160) *Dongjing menghua lu* 東京夢華錄 (A dream of splendors of the eastern capital) and Wu Zimu's 吳自牧 (fl. 1300) *Mengliang lu* 夢梁錄 (Record of the millet dream), two reminiscences of life in the Song capitals of Kaifeng and Hangzhou respectively.

Meng's work appeared in 1147, "when nostalgia for the material comfort and urban joys of Kaifeng hung like mist in the air" in Stephen West's evocative phrase, but it seems to have taken on heightened significance for seventeenth-century readers.²⁸ Zhou Lianggong's family reprinted the work in Nanjing after the sacking of Kaifeng in 1642–1643, and Yu Huai explicitly acknowledges it as the model for his *Banqiao zaji* 板橋雜記 (Miscellaneous records of the plank bridge), completed in 1693.²⁹ For Meng, Song-era Kaifeng was a city in which

²⁷ Grace S. Fong, "Reclaiming Subjectivity in a Time of Loss: Ye Shaoyuan (1589–1648) and Autobiographical Writing in the Ming–Qing Transition," *Ming Studies* 59 (2009): 21–41.

²⁸ Stephen H. West, "The Interpretation of a Dream: The Sources, Evaluation, and Influence of the *Dongjing meng Hua lu*," *T'oung Pao* 71.1 (1985): 66.

²⁹ Hongnam Kim, *The Life of a Patron: Zhou Lianggong (1612–1672) and the Painters of*

“extravagance (*chishe* 侈奢) invigorated men’s spirits” and “rarities (*zhenqi* 珍奇) from the four seas all found their way to the markets,” a vision that bears more than a passing resemblance to the late Ming world as nostalgically depicted by many of those who lived through the Manchu conquest.³⁰ Such records tend to be somewhat ambivalent about the cities they describe, their celebratory tone punctuated by the sense that an excessive concern with consumption and decadence had eroded both the practical ability and the moral authority of the ruling elite to govern its polity.

That political power could be gained through frugality and lost through extravagance is explicitly articulated in the *Shuoyuan* 說苑 (Garden of tales), attributed to Liu Xiang 劉向 (ca. 79–6 BCE). The legendary sage-ruler Yao 堯 eats from a simple earthenware vessel and hence receives the submission of all of the feudal lords within his territory. For Yao’s successors, by contrast, political control over their territories decreases as their eating vessels become ever more extravagant.³¹ The moral behind this idea remained resonant well into the late imperial period. One early Yuan commentator, Liu Yiqing 劉一清 (fl. late thirteenth to early fourteenth centuries), was in no doubt as to what caused the fall of the Southern Song capital at Hangzhou:

While scholar-officials were consumed by the excesses of singing and dancing on the lake and in the hills 湖山歌舞之餘, the affairs of state were beyond their consideration, and in the end armies were lost, rulers were poorly advised, territory was ceded, and the dynasty betrayed.³²

Liu Yiqing might have considered Nanjing a more appropriate location for a dynastic capital than Hangzhou, but in truth no city in late imperial China was more burdened by the weight of its failed dynastic past than Nanjing. Centuries earlier, the monk Qi Ji 齊己 (ca. 863–937) similarly attributed the fall of the Nanjing-based Chen dynasty (557–589) to the fact that rulers had been more concerned

Seventeenth-Century China (New York: China Institute in America, 1996), p. 200n122; Yu Huai, preface (*xu* 序) to *Banqiao zaji*, 3 *juan*, in *Yu Huai quanji*, v. 2, p. 404.

³⁰ Meng Yuanlao, preface (*xu*) to *Dongjing menghua lu jianzhu* 東京夢華錄箋注, ed. Yi Yongwen 伊永文, 2nd ed., 10 *juan* in 2 vols. (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 2006), v. 1, p. 1.

³¹ Craig Clunas, *Superfluous Things: Material Culture and Social Status in Early Modern China* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1991), pp. 141–43.

³² Liu Yiqing, *Qiantang yishi* 錢塘遺事, 10 *juan* (Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 1985), j. 1, p. 1a.

with song and dance than with looking after the people.³³ Nanjing served as the capital of Wu (222–280) during the Three Kingdoms period; the Eastern Jin (317–420); the four Southern Dynasties of Song (420–479), Qi (479–502), Liang (502–557), and Chen during the Six Dynasties period; and later, during the Five Dynasties period, as capital of the Southern Tang (937–975). Long thought to possess a certain “royal *qi*” (*wangqi* 王氣), Nanjing’s strategic position was embodied in the phrase *longpan huju* 龍蟠虎踞 (coiling dragon, crouching tiger), an oft-repeated description conventionally attributed to Zhuge Liang 諸葛亮 (181–234) and implying, somewhat ironically given the city’s history, that the surrounding topography made it impregnable.

As Stephen Owen shows in his classic *HJAS* study, the landscape of Nanjing embodied the melancholy of the rise and fall of ages, through “an overlay of sites, images, and phrases that shaped the way the city was seen,” and by the late Tang, poetic mediation on the city’s historical sites had become a firmly established mode of writing.³⁴ Having vanquished the Chen in 589, the founding emperor of the Sui dynasty ordered that Jiankang 建康 (Nanjing) be entirely leveled and returned to agricultural cultivation.³⁵ This tragic end helped to make the vaguely imagined decadence of the Six Dynasties period in particular come to define the city, a pervasive—almost oppressive—set of images through which future generations of writers were forced to navigate.³⁶ Much like Calvino’s city of Clarice, the Nanjing of old represented for late imperial writers “an unparalleled model of every splendor, compared to which the city’s present state can only cause more sighs at every fading of the stars.”³⁷ Already by the eighth century, Li Bai 李白 (701–762) was “heav[ing] a hopeless sigh/For the white bones of Liang and Chen/Tangled as strands of hemp.”³⁸

³³ Qi Ji 齊己, “Kan Jinling tu” 看金陵圖, in *Bailian ji* 白蓮集, 10 *juan*, in vol. 172 of *Sibu congkan chubian* (Shanghai: Shangwu yinshuguan, 1936), v. 2, j. 9, pp. 12a–b.

³⁴ Stephen Owen, “Place: Mediation on the Past at Chin-ling,” *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 50.2 (1990): 417–57, doi: 10.2307/2719203.

³⁵ *Suishu* 隋書, ed. Wei Zheng 魏徵 et al., 85 *juan* in 6 *ce* 冊 in 3 vols. (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1973), v. 2, c. 3, j. 31, p. 876; *Zizhi tongjian xinzhuzhu* 資治通鑑新注, ed. Zhou Pengfei 周鵬飛 et al., 294 *juan* in 10 vols. (Xi’an: Shaanxi renmin chubanshe, 1998), v. 6, j. 177, p. 5777.

³⁶ On the flourishing commercial culture of Jiankang during the Six Dynasties period, see Liu Shufen 劉淑芬, *Liuchao de chengshi yu shehui* 六朝的城市與社會 (Taipei: Taiwan xuesheng shuju, 1992).

³⁷ Italo Calvino, *Invisible Cities*, trans. William Weaver (London: Vintage, 1997), p. 106.

³⁸ Li Bai 李白, “Jinling ge songbie Fan Xuan” 金陵歌送別范宣, in *Li Taibai quanji* 李

On one level, Yu Binshuo's survey of Nanjing fits comfortably within this long tradition of lament for the city's faded past. At Crouching Tiger Pass (Hujuguan 虎踞關), he observes, "Somehow this is the spot that draws those lamenting the autumn 悲秋客/Alone in this vast expanse one can only sing of the four sorrows [of Zhang Heng 張衡 (78–139)]"—an appropriately melancholy sentiment at the spot at which Zhuge Liang had reputedly spoken of the impenetrability of the city (p. 44a).³⁹ At the site of the once-thriving Sun Chu's tavern (Sun Chu jiulou 孫楚酒樓), made famous in a poem by Li Bai, Yu sighs over "the hats and robes of antiquity all covered in weeds; / Relics of Six Dynasties culture interred in wasteland" (p. 14a).⁴⁰ At Bracing Terrace (Qingliangtai 清涼臺), the site of the old Southern Tang summer retreats, Yu notes the melancholy brought on every year at the end of autumn, when the trees are stripped bare: "None who climbs to this terrace does not feel the pain of 'fluttering fall' [*yaoluo* 搖落], sharing in the sorrow of Yu Xin 庾信 [513–581] and reliving the grief of Song Yu [ca. 290–223 BCE]" (pp. 45b–46a).⁴¹ Song Yu was instrumental in establishing what Alfreda Murck calls the "mournful vocabulary for autumn" appropriated by generations of poets.⁴² Yu would have expected readers to recognize his allusion to these two key figures in the literature of lament as an echo of Du Fu's 杜甫 (712–770) famous "Yonghuai guji" 詠懷古跡 (Laments on traces of ancient sites) poem cycle.⁴³

Such entries are primarily concerned with temporal displacement, but Yu's Nanjing is also a site of spatial dislocation, and Eastern Jin culture pervades the survey. The tombs of Xie Lingyun 謝靈運 (385–433), Bian Kun 卞壺 (281–328), Xie An 謝安 (320–385), and Wang Xian-

太白全集, ed. Wang Qi 王琦, 36 *juan* in 3 vols. (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1977), v. 1, j. 7, pp. 409–11; Owen, "Place," p. 425 (romanization altered).

³⁹ Zhang Heng, "Sichou shi si shou" 四愁詩四首, in *Wenxuan* 文選, ed. Xiao Tong 蕭統, 60 *juan* in 6 vols. (Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 1986), v. 3, j. 29, pp. 1356–58.

⁴⁰ Li Bai, "Wanyue Jinling chengxi Sun Chu jiulou" 玩月金陵城西孫楚酒樓 in *Li Taibai quanji*, v. 2, j. 19, pp. 894–95.

⁴¹ For the use of this term by these two men, see Yu Xin, "Kushu fu" 枯樹賦, in *Yu Zishan ji* 庾子山集, ed. Ni Fan 倪璠, 16 *juan*; SKQS edition, j. 1, pp. 37b–45b, and (for Song Yu) *Chuci jizhu* 楚辭集注, ed. Zhu Xi 朱熹, 8 *juan*; SKQS edition, j. 6, pp. 1a–2a. For *yaoluo* as "fluttering fall" see *Ch'u Tz'u, The Songs of the South: An Ancient Chinese Anthology*, trans. David Hawkes (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1959), p. 92.

⁴² Alfreda Murck, *Poetry and Painting in Song China: The Subtle Art of Dissent* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Asia Center, 2000), p. 13.

⁴³ Du Fu, "Yonghuai guji wu shou" 詠懷古跡五首, in *Yuding Quan Tang shi* 御定全唐詩, 900 *juan*; SKQS edition, j. 230, pp. 3b–4b.

zhi 王獻之 (344–386) are all carefully recorded, and at New Pavilion (Xinting 新亭), Yu pauses to include an anecdote from that period (pp. 16a–b):

All those of the Jin dynasty who had crossed the Yangtze River 晉過江諸人 [that is, refugees from the Western Jin capital in the north] gathered outside of New Pavilion to share in a feast on a day of leisure. Zhou Yi 周顗 [269–322], sitting among them, sighed and said, “the scene is not dissimilar, but when I raise my eyes, I can see the foreignness of these rivers and hills.” Everyone looked at each other and wept, whereupon Councilor-in-Chief Wang Dao 王導 [276–339], his face flushed with emotion, responded, “We ought to be bringing our strength together at the central plains and recovering the sacred provinces. How have we ended up facing each other weeping like the ‘prisoners of Chu’?”⁴⁴

Although the families of these northern émigrés would eventually transform themselves into the new southern ruling elite, the process of integration was far from straightforward. Emperor Yuan 元 of Jin (Sima Rui 司馬睿, r. 318–323) is said to have “felt ashamed of lodging in another people’s state,” and the sense of loss and dislocation in the writings of this first exiled generation is palpable in their writings.⁴⁵

Reimagining the City

The sentiments expressed in Yu’s New Pavilion passage above must have sounded all too familiar to those who looked back from the standpoint of the early Qing. The physical displacement of the Eastern Jin refugees clearly produced what we might term a “cultural disorientation,” in which people “find themselves in the grip of a new culture, or more precisely when the socialized, internalized culture that they carry ‘in their heads’ or in their semi-automatic ‘habits of the heart’ clashes with the cultural environment in which they find themselves.”⁴⁶ As

⁴⁴ Versions of this story appear in *Shishuo xinyu* 世說新語, comp. Liu Yiqing 劉義慶, 3 *juan*; SKQS edition, j. 1, pp. 34b–35a, and *Jinshu* 晉書, ed. Fang Xuanling 房玄齡, 130 *juan* in 3 vols. (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1974), v. 3, j. 65, p. 1747. For “prisoners of Chu,” see the 9th entry for the 9th year of Duke Cheng 成公九年, in *Chunqiu Zuozhuan zhu* 春秋左傳注, ed. Yang Bojun 楊伯峻, 4 vols. (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1981), v. 2, pp. 844–45.

⁴⁵ Xiaofei Tian, “From the Eastern Jin through the Early Tang (317–649),” in *The Cambridge History of Chinese Literature*, ed. Kang-i Sun Chang and Stephen Owen, 2 vols. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), v. 1, p. 203.

⁴⁶ Sztompka, “Cultural Trauma,” p. 454.

I suggest at the beginning of this article, the early Qing period itself seems to have been similarly disorienting for a number of men and women, not because the rivers and hills around them had suddenly become foreign, but because they were *temporally* removed from their internalized cultural environment. In this context, I read Yu Binshuo's survey of Nanjing as a kind of discursive coping strategy—an individual response to a collective cultural trauma he has inherited—and as a way for him to make some kind of sense out of the early Qing world. His subtle yet insistent goal throughout is to overlay the important landmarks of Ming history onto the city's longer and more ephemeral dynastic history and to reimagine historic Nanjing as the center of Ming culture. He is particularly concerned that the city's ancient sites are distinguished correctly and that Ming culture not be allowed to disappear like so much of Nanjing's earlier, more ephemeral, poetic past.

The survey begins with Yu's description of his (and our) distress at viewing the ruins of the Ming palace in the city's eastern quarter (p. 1b): "Passing by and pausing at the former palace, is it possible not to feel the grief of lush millet and flourishing wheat 黍離麥秀之悲?" The allusion here is to two poems composed to mourn the loss of the former capitals of the Shang and Zhou, as recorded in the *Shiji* 史記 (Historical records) and the *Shijing* 詩經 (Classic of poetry) respectively.⁴⁷ As Stephen Owen and Wu Hung note in their discussions of these poems, there are no references to buildings or ruins in either text; these meanings come entirely from exegeses provided by Sima Qian 司馬遷 (ca. 145–85 BCE), and Mao Heng 毛亨 (fl. second or third century BCE).⁴⁸ From the very beginning of the survey then, Yu draws the Ming into Nanjing's extended literary tradition of dynastic lament and ascribes to the ruins of the Ming palace a gravitas that places it on a par with those of the Shang and Zhou.

From this point on, the arrangement of the sixty-part survey gives structural form to Yu's reimagining of the city, with two important early Ming sites enclosing—like the city walls themselves—the

⁴⁷ Sima Qian 司馬遷, *Shiji* 史記, 130 *juan* in 10 vols. (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1982), v. 5, j. 38, pp. 1620–21; "Shu li" 黍離 [Mao no. 65], in *Shijing jinzhu jinyi* 詩經今註今譯, ed. Ma Chiying 馬持盈 (Taipei: Taiwan shangwu yinshuguan, 1971), pp. 99–100.

⁴⁸ Stephen Owen, *Remembrances: The Experience of the Past in Classical Chinese Literature* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1986), pp. 20–21; Wu Hung, *A Story of Ruins: Presence and Absence in Chinese Art and Visual Culture* (London: Reaktion Books, 2012), pp. 27–28.

historical sites of previous eras. He begins at the Former Inner Palace (Jiunei 舊內), which had been Zhu Yuanzhang's 朱元璋 (1328–1398) seat of power in the city prior to the formal establishment of the Ming dynasty, and he concludes at the Hall of Great Foundations (Dabentang 大本堂). The survey thus moves between Zhu Yuanzhang's early rise to power and the lasting legacy of his reign as the Hongwu 洪武 emperor (r. 1368–1398). As early as the first entry, we get a sense of Yu as the omniscient historian—able to step beyond the present and see the significance of a historical site in a way that distinguishes him from the rest of the population. The roof of the Former Inner Palace has long since collapsed and is used by the local residents (*jumin* 居民) as a planting ground. They go about their work, while for Yu, “Soft shadows creep across the palace walls/Tears dampen my robes as I mourn the rise and fall of ages” (p. 2b).

Lynn Struve identifies a tendency to favor a “martial brand of heroism” and to esteem those who “took vigorous, necessary, practical, and physically demanding action to save their dynasty and their people” as a key characteristic of the generation that came of age in the middle decades of the Kangxi 康熙 emperor's reign (1661–1722).⁴⁹ Song-dynasty martyrs, and their strong but ultimately unsuccessful responses to non-Han invaders from the north, were long-standing exemplars of these ideals, whose symbolic significance was clearly heightened following the Manchu conquest. For example, one of Yu Binshuo's early Qing contemporaries, Wan Sitong 萬斯同 (1638–1702), compiled *Songji zhongyi lu* 宋季忠義錄 (Record of loyal and righteous men of the Song), a collection of 544 biographies of Song loyalists. This earlier history of conflict, loyalism, and martyrdom is also present in Yu's *Jinling langu*. Near Wood's End Pavilion (Mumoting 木末亭), Yu carefully records the locations of the shrines of the three Song-dynasty martyrs Wen Tianxiang 文天祥 (1236–1283), Li Ruoshui 李若水 (1093–1127), and Yang Bangyi 楊邦義 (1086–1129). Yang, who had been killed after refusing to submit to Jin invaders in 1129, also features in the survey's following essay. Yu visits a small stele carved with the characters “where the heart was bared” (*pouxin chu* 剖心處), indicating that the location is not only where Yang met his violent death but also where he revealed his steadfast moral character (pp. 21b–22b).

⁴⁹ Struve, “Ambivalence and Action,” p. 332.

Yu is at pains to overlay Ming landmarks of conflict, loyalism, and martyrdom onto the spatial order of the city. At Rakshasa Jetty (Luo-shaji 羅殺磯), Yu records (pp. 14a–b) that it is the location of the suicide of Huang Guan 黃觀 (1364–1402), who lost his life at the conclusion of the 1399–1402 civil war and who was later branded one of the Jianwen 建文 emperor's (r. 1399–1402) “treacherous officials” (*jianchen* 奸臣) by propaganda during the Yongle 永樂 era (1403–1424).⁵⁰ The graves of Huang's wife (née Weng 翁) and two daughters, and the details of their own suicides in the aftermath of the fall of Nanjing are also carefully recorded. Yu's prose text is rich with carefully noted details, while his poem uses the natural landscape as a metaphor for dynastic loss: “On the river, thoughts turn to Egret Isle/The rise and fall of the tide 潮生潮落 evokes melancholy” (p. 14b). Here, a play on the character *chao* 潮 (tide), as a homophone of *chao* 朝 (dynasty), makes the metaphor more explicit, while also underscoring the significance of 1402 in the history of Nanjing and of the Ming dynasty itself. Later he lingers (pp. 21b–22b) at the shrine to Fang Xiaoru 方孝孺 (1357–1402), perhaps the best known of the civil-war martyrs, and at the burial place of those who suffered from the “ten degrees” of extermination handed down to Fang's family and acquaintances. Refusing to draft the edict announcing the accession to the throne of the victorious Prince of Yan 燕王 (Zhu Di 朱棣; 1360–1424), Fang instead questioned the legitimacy of the succession. This particular act of loyalty to the Jianwen emperor, according to Gu Yingtai 谷應泰 (*jinshi* 進士 1647), cost some 873 people their lives.⁵¹ Clearly for Yu, such sites form a key part of Nanjing's sacred geography of martyrdom.

The vaguely imagined splendors of the Southern Dynasties, so prevalent in earlier accounts of the city, are certainly not entirely absent from Yu's survey. Like many before him, Yu takes almost voyeuristic delight in the decadence of the halls built at Fragrant Pleasures Garden (Fangleiyuan 芳樂苑), where Xiao Baojuan 蕭寶卷 of Qi (Marquis of Donghun 東昏侯; r. 499–501) famously had his Consort Pan 潘 walk on lotus blossoms shaped from gold leaf (pp. 52b–54a).⁵² Consort Pan

⁵⁰ On Huang Guan, see Yin Zhi 尹直 (1427–1511), “Shizhong Huang gong yanxing lu” 侍中黃公言行錄, in *Ming mingchen wanyan lu* 明名臣琬琰錄, ed. Xu Hong 徐紘, 24 *juan*; SKQS edition, j. 12, pp. 8a–11a.

⁵¹ Gu Yingtai, *Mingshi jishi benmo* 明史紀事本末, 80 *juan* in 4 vols. (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1977), v. 1, j. 18, p. 292.

⁵² Li Tingshou 李延壽 ed., *Nanshi* 南史, 80 *juan* in 3 vols. (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1975), v. 1, j. 5, pp. 153–54.

was a femme fatale who loomed large in the literati imagination, and as Dorothy Ko notes, the lotus blossom anecdote and its retellings capture something of that “fin-de-siècle splendor” of the period that appealed to later storytellers.⁵³

But for Yu Binshuo, such spectacles are more than surpassed by the Ming dynasty's own version of fin-de-siècle splendor, and he discusses the Qinhuai 秦淮 pleasure quarter at length (pp. 32b–33b), listing a number of late Ming courtesans by name, including Ma Shouzhen 馬守貞 (1548–1604), Zhao Caiji 趙彩姬, Zhu Wuxia 朱無瑕 (fl. 1569), and Zheng Ruying 鄭如英, whose works were published as *Qinhuai simeiren xuangao* 秦淮四美人選稿 (Draft selections from the four beauties of Qinhuai).⁵⁴ The sections of the survey that detail the crowds, lights, sounds, and fragrances of late Ming Qinhuai perhaps betray Yu Huai's influence most strongly, although it is worth noting that Binshuo's account predates his father's *Banqiao zaji* by many years. Following the change in dynasty, Yu Binshuo's entry concludes, “that former charm drifted off with the clouds, and those blissful days dissolved with the mist. The dance kiosks and song stages have all given way to flourishing weeds” (p. 33a).

The Qinhuai pleasure quarter was an important dimension of the late Ming Nanjing experience, and indeed, as Monica Merlin shows, Ma Shouzhen herself posthumously became a part of the touring itinerary of the city during the seventeenth century.⁵⁵ Far more than a diversion from matters of state, the pleasure quarter (often referred to as the Old Compound [Jiuyuan 舊院] in seventeenth-century accounts) dated back to the Hongwu reign itself, and to many, its location directly across the river from the examination halls linked it inextricably to the fate of the dynasty as a whole. Thus, Yu Huai would later vigorously defend his description of the pleasure quarter as being “concerned with the rise and fall of a dynasty and the emotions and sighs of a thousand autumns,” rather than a mere frivolous diversion.⁵⁶ At each of these locations, the sense is that Ming history is inextricably linked to the city and that here the local carries empire-wide significance.

⁵³ Dorothy Ko, *Every Step a Lotus: Shoes for Bound Feet* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2001), pp. 31–32.

⁵⁴ See the “Run” 閩 section in Qian Qianyi, *Liechao shiji xiaozhuan* 列朝詩集小傳, 2 vols. (Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 1983), v. 2, pp. 765–67.

⁵⁵ Monica Merlin, “The Nanjing Courtesan Ma Shouzhen (1548–1604): Gender, Space and Painting in the Late Ming Pleasure Quarter,” *Gender and History* 23.3 (2011): 639.

⁵⁶ Yu Huai, preface to *Banqiao zaji*, v. 2, p. 404.

History as Moral Obligation

A strong sense of obligation to record correctly the historical topography of Nanjing is a pervasive element of Yu Binshuo's survey, and from the outset, he casts himself in the role of the ill-fated historian born at the wrong time.⁵⁷ Explicitly linking his own project with those of the two great figures of the exile-writing tradition, Yu establishes his moral authority to view and interpret the city in his preface:

Qu Yuan 屈原 [ca. 340–278 BCE] was banished and then wrote *Encountering Sorrow* (*Lisao* 離騷). Sima Qian was castrated, then completed the *Historical Records*. When men of the past were unable to realize their ambitions in their own times 不得志於時, they turned to writing, by this means harnessing the melancholy and dejection of unfulfilled ambition. The old saying that “literary accomplishment is born from poverty” refers to this type of circumstance. Reading this, the superior man (*junzi* 君子) will be able to understand my purpose. (pp. 2a–b)

Echoing Sima Qian's famous “Letter to Ren An,” which lists a number of men (including Qu Yuan) who failed to achieve their goals but went on to produce extraordinary literature for posterity, Yu removes himself from the uncertainty of his present circumstances and anticipates a “superior man” (in a Confucian moral sense) as his future reader.⁵⁸ By Sima Qian's own account, the *Shiji* had to “await the sages and superior men of future ages” (*si houshi shengren junzi* 俟後世聖人君子), itself probably an allusion to Confucius' preparation of the *Chunqiu* 春秋 (Annals of the spring and autumn period).⁵⁹ Sima Qian's reading of Confucius' role as historian—concerned with what Wai-yee Li describes as “remembrance, the continuity of tradition, the definition of culture, [and] the refusal to allow greatness to pass into oblivion”⁶⁰—is key to understanding Yu Binshuo's survey, for his self-

⁵⁷ On remembering as an important component of Nanjing literati identity in a different context, see Chuck Wooldridge, “What Literati Talked about When They Talked about Memory: Commemorating Resistance to the Taiping in Nanjing's Yu Garden, 1900–1911,” *Twentieth-Century China* 40.1 (2015): 3–24.

⁵⁸ Ban Gu 班固, ed., *Qian Han shu* 前漢書, 120 *juan*; SKQS edition, j. 62, p. 26b.

⁵⁹ Sima Qian, “Taishigong zixu” 太史公自序, in *Shiji*, v. 10, j. 130, p. 3320; year 14 of Duke Ai 哀公十四年, in *Chunqiu Gongyangzhuan zhushu* 春秋公羊傳注疏, 28 *juan*; SKQS edition, j. 28, p. 23b.

⁶⁰ Wai-yee Li, “The Idea of Authority in the *Shih chi* (*Records of the Historian*),” *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 54.2 (1994): 361, doi: 10.2307/2719434.

appointed role as delineator and transmitter of the history of Nanjing must similarly be read as an attempt to prevent the greatness of the Ming dynasty itself from slipping away. Thus the *Jinling langu* can be read as an “active, constructive adaptation” to cultural trauma (in Sztompka’s terms), in which Yu attempts to make sense of the threat to collective identity that the fall of the Ming represents.⁶¹

Of particular concern to Yu is the potential for the relationship between name and reality to break down (*mingshi shiju* 名實失據), for if this rupture should occur, those touring the city would be unable to identify each site by name, and the city’s unique “exquisiteness” (*jiali* 佳麗) would be lost.⁶² So in the *bingwu* 丙午 year (1666), Yu took to the road:

With a heavy heart (*xin bu le* 心不樂), I “yoked the horses”⁶³ and set out to roam among the hills and the streams, reflecting melancholically on the prosperity and the decline of ages. Seeking out the extraordinary, pursuing the superior, uncovering the hidden, reaching the remote—at every site I wrote a poem (*shi* 詩), and for every poem I wrote a prose record (*ji* 記), by this means collecting some sixty [corresponding] sets. In future, anyone wishing to investigate the ancient sites will be able to consult this record, as easily as pointing to his own palm. (pp. 1b–2a)

Yu Binshuo’s self-confessed heavy heart underscores the obligation he feels with regard to the city of Nanjing. This is no mere tourist jaunt but a serious act of guardianship, at a time when the preservation of shared cultural heritage had taken on a new sense of urgency.

This urgency was equally apparent to Yu’s contemporaries, but responses were varied. Chen Weisong 陳維崧 (1626–1682), Wang Shilu 王士禛 (1626–1673), and Wang Shizhen 王士禛 (1634–1711) were all involved in collecting and publishing poems that had been left on walls by women—ephemeral traces of the Ming past that seemed in particular danger of being lost in the disorder of the mid-seventeenth century.⁶⁴

⁶¹ Sztompka, “Cultural Trauma,” p. 461.

⁶² Xie Tiao 謝朓 (464–499) originated use of the term *jiali di* 佳麗地; see *Jingding Jiankang zhi* 景定建康志, comp. Zhou Yinghe 周應合, 50 *juan* in 2 vols. (Taipei: Chengwen chubanshe, 1983), v. 2, j. 37, p. 2a.

⁶³ The phrase *jiayan chuyou* 駕言出遊 alludes to a line from the *Shijing* ode “Quan shui” 泉水 [Mao no. 39], in *Shijing jinzhu jinyi*, p. 59. Compare Yu Huai’s use of this same phrase in the opening lines of his *Sanwu youlanzhi* 三吳游覽志 of 1650; *Yu Huai quanji*, v. 2, p. 374.

⁶⁴ Judith T. Zeitlin, “Disappearing Verses: Writing on Walls and Anxieties of Loss,” in *Writing and Materiality in China: Essays in Honor of Patrick Hanan*, ed. Judith T. Zeitlin

Wan Sitong pointedly refused to accept an official bureaucratic position under the Qing but still felt compelled to labor privately after 1679 on what would eventually become the *Mingshi gao* 明史稿 (Draft of Ming history).⁶⁵ The context was one in which the destruction of Ming cultural heritage suggested to seventeenth-century observers “both the precariousness of the past’s material legacy and the moral necessity to rescue the most perishable aspects of it from oblivion.”⁶⁶ In cultural-trauma terms, these are all types of active adaptations to the perceived threat to collective identity, a threat apparently no less real to these men who had known the Ming only as children.

For Yu Binshuo, this moral necessity manifests itself in almost obsessive attention to the accurate recording of sites and locations and to the checking of such details against historical textual evidence. This obsession is perhaps most evident in a lengthy appendix to his entry on Tile Works Temple (Waguansi 瓦官寺), founded at the behest of the monk Huili 慧力 (fl. 345–365) during the fourth century CE on the site of a former ceramics manufactory and, for a time, one of the most important Buddhist monasteries in the region. Yu is distressed (p. 38b) by the apparent discrepancy between “what is now called Tile Works” (*jin zhi suowei Waguan* 今之所謂瓦官) and the site as described in the historical records and gazetteers. Not only were the site’s “ancient traces” (*guji* 故跡) lost, but because local people had never bothered to check the old sources properly, a vastly inferior site thus ended up being mistaken for a famous ancient landmark (*gu zhi mingsheng* 古之名勝). When he reaches Phoenix Terrace (Fenghuangtai 鳳皇臺), for which the locals now commonly use the name “Upper Tile Works” (Shang Waguan 上瓦官), Yu can only sigh with exasperation (pp. 39a–40a). This preoccupation with the name-reality relationship betrays what Lynn Struve identifies as a “growing ambivalence toward the authority of the written word” that she sees as characteristic of early Kangxi-era scholarship.⁶⁷ At such points in the text, Yu’s frustration is palpable, perhaps betraying an underlying anxiety about his own future textual legacy.

and Lydia H. Liu with Ellen Widmer (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Asia Center, 2003), pp. 72–132.

⁶⁵ *Eminent Chinese of the Ch'ing Period*, v. 2, pp. 801–3.

⁶⁶ Zeitlin, “Disappearing Verses,” p. 107.

⁶⁷ Struve, “Ambivalence and Action,” p. 336.

Rationale and Significance

Yu Binshuo's attempt to recast the city of Nanjing as a principally Ming space has a distinctly visual dimension (as implied by the use of the term *lan* 覽 in the title of the work), and recent scholarship on images of the city adds a crucial intellectual context to Yu's historicizing exercise.⁶⁸ The Ming polity originated in Nanjing: a new imperial palace was constructed, and the city as a whole, bounded by a new set of city walls, was expanded into an unusual shape thought to capture better the advantages of the terrain. The Hongwu emperor and his close officials were, from the outset, at pains to distinguish this new capital at Nanjing from the capitals of his dynastic predecessors, who had conspicuously failed to unify the empire.⁶⁹ The emperor himself insisted that his capital was "not the Jinling 金陵 of ancient times nor the Jianye 建業 of the Six Dynasties" and commissioned a new atlas, the *Hongwu jingcheng tuzhi* 洪武京城圖志 (Illustrated gazetteer of the Hongwu capital, 1395), a work that reinforces visually this claim to uniqueness.⁷⁰

In a rhetorical move that would become more common in later periods, a preface to the Hongwu atlas by Wang Junhua 王峻華 (fl. late fourteenth century) is explicitly derogatory about the political (as opposed to cultural) achievements of the Southern Dynasties, whose imperial domains were far more limited in scope than those of the Ming.⁷¹ As the preeminent scholar-official Song Lian 宋濂 (1310–1381) comments, the Southern Dynasties "failed to respond to the royal *qi* of the landscape" (*wu yi ying shanchuan zhi wangqi* 無以應山川之王氣), a clear contrast with the founding emperor of the Ming, who at last represented a suitable occupant for the site.⁷²

⁶⁸ On *lan* as "surveying" and "a mode of looking that is particularly privileged in travel," see Emma J. Teng, "Texts on the Right and Pictures on the Left: Reading the Qing Record of Frontier Taiwan," in *Writing and Materiality in China*, p. 461.

⁶⁹ Si-yen Fei, *Negotiating Urban Space: Urbanization and Late Ming Nanjing* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Asia Center, 2009), p. 132.

⁷⁰ Zhu Yuanzhang, *Ming Taizu wenji* 明太祖文集, 20 *juan*; SKQS edition, j. 14, p. 6a; *Hongwu jingcheng tuzhi*, 1 *juan*, in vol. 24 of *Beijing tushuguan guji zhenben congkan* 北京圖書館古籍珍本叢刊 (Beijing: Shumu wenxian chubanshe, 1988); Si-yen Fei, *Negotiating Urban Space*, pp. 134–40.

⁷¹ Wang Junhua, "Hongwu jingcheng tuzhi ji" 洪武京城圖志記, in *Hongwu jingcheng tuzhi*, pp. 3a–5b.

⁷² Song Lian, "Yuejiang lou ji" 閱江樓記, in *Wenxian ji* 文憲集, 32 *juan*; SKQS edition, j. 3, p. 1a.

In the event, Nanjing's supposedly advantageous terrain was once again unable to protect it from northern invaders in 1402, and the gradual transfer of official functions north during the Yongle era, culminating in the official transfer of its "primary capital" (*jingshi* 京師) designation to Beijing in 1421, meant that Nanjing's place at the center of the Ming empire was short-lived.⁷³ In this context, the long, tangled history of the city's dynastic past continued to loom large in the collective imagination of the Jiangnan elite throughout the Ming period. The Hongwu-era expansion of the city walls had, after all, actually incorporated—rather than excluded—the significant sites of the Six Dynasties period into the spatial identity of the new city.

The lingering existence of distinct and potentially conflicting identities within the city of Nanjing is given visual form in the *Jinling gujin tukao* 金陵古今圖考 (Ancient and contemporary maps of Jinling examined, 1516) by Chen Yi 陳沂 (1469–1538), which includes, among other images, *Lidai hujian tu* 歷代互見圖 (Superimposed maps [of Jinling] through the ages), a conceptual map that imagines sites from various ages all simultaneously layered either within the spatial confines of the Ming city walls or just beyond them (fig. 1).⁷⁴ This type of image was not unique to the Ming, but Catherine Stuer points convincingly to an increasing tension from the sixteenth century onward between Nanjing as the locus of Six Dynasties culture and as the center of a Ming imperial enterprise in visual representations.⁷⁵ Citing an apparently exasperated Li Deng 李登, who asked why people would continue to focus on "the old habits of the Six Dynasties" (*Liuchao zhi guxi* 六朝之故習) rather than the cultural accomplishments of the Ming present, Stuer sees the articulation of a culturally distinct Ming identity as an explicit objective of the 1593 *Shangyuan xianzhi* 上元縣志 (Gazetteer of Shangyuan County), for which Li Deng was partly responsible.⁷⁶ In a sense this objective links this work to Yu Binshuo's survey, which, I argue, is partly an attempt to draw this same distinc-

⁷³ On the capital's transfer, see Edward L. Farmer, *Early Ming Government: The Evolution of Dual Capitals* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Asia Center, 1976), pp. 114–28.

⁷⁴ *Lidai hujian tu*, in Chen Yi, *Jinling gujin tukao*, 1 juan (Nanjing: Zhu Zhifan, 1624), pp. 34a–b; Sinica 652, Chinese Premodern Collections, Bodleian Library, Oxford University, Oxford, UK, <http://allegro.bodleian.ox.ac.uk/chinese/201310071142100dh>.

⁷⁵ Catherine Stuer, "Dimensions of Place: Map, Itinerary, and Trace in Images of Nanjing," (PhD diss., University of Chicago, 2012), pp. 249–53.

⁷⁶ Stuer, "Dimensions of Place," pp. 251–52.

tion. But for Yu, the pastness of the Ming dynasty means that its preservation takes on a sense of urgency not present in the 1593 work. It also means that landmarks of Ming culture are defined differently: as “ancient sites” (*gu* 古).

Elsewhere, Si-yen Fei views the *Jinling tuyong* 金陵圖詠 (Illustrated odes on Jinling), compiled by Zhu Zhifan 朱之蕃 (1557–1624) around 1623, as a work that “subverted the sway of poetic Nanjing” by depicting the city as “a lived space” rather than as merely a subject for poets and painters.⁷⁷ For Fei, early Qing adaptations of the *Jinling tuyong* images tend to reduce significantly the secondary spaces—and therefore the urban sociality—of their late Ming antecedents, a process she sees as a gesture toward “a deliberately ambiguous acknowledgment” of the dynastic transition, which articulates “a new identity that reconciles the past and the present.”⁷⁸ In this context, it is fascinating to note that Yu Binshuo’s Nanjing is also an unequivocally *asocial* space, in which urban sociality has similarly been elided. Like the archetypal urban flaneur, Yu is alone on his tour, and the only people who feature in any meaningful way in his survey are long dead. But although Yu’s attempt to resituate the moral authority of the Great Ming within the spatial hierarchy of historic Nanjing must be read within this wider context of visual representation that Fei and Stuer describe, a physical tour has the potential to move beyond and even challenge any mapped vision of the city, as Michel de Certeau reminds us.⁷⁹ Yu’s itinerary of sites and sights (some of which are no longer visible) writes a new version of the city, creating new connections and new hierarchies that respond to his particular context. In this regard, it is worth noting that his Nanjing is to some extent a personal one, in that he includes his own dwellings at Maidens’ Pools (Gutang 姑塘) and Apricot Blossom Village (Xinghuacun 杏花村) in the survey (pp. 19b–20a, 34a–b).

Yu’s concern, implied throughout the survey—to distinguish clearly between the various ages of Nanjing’s past and to reestablish the preeminence of the Ming within that long history—is finally made

⁷⁷ Siyen Fei, “Ways of Looking: The Creation and Social Use of Urban Guidebooks in Sixteenth- and Seventeenth-Century China,” *Urban History* 37.2 (2010): 235–40; Si-yen Fei, *Negotiating Urban Space*, pp. 172–85; Zhu Zhifan, *Jinling tuyong* (preface 1623), 1 *juan* (Nanjing: Zhu Zhifan, 1624); Sinica 652, Chinese Premodern Collections, Bodleian Library.

⁷⁸ Siyen Fei, “Ways of Looking,” p. 245.

⁷⁹ Michel de Certeau, *The Practice of Everyday Life*, trans. Steven Rendall (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984), pp. 91–130.



Harvard-Yenching Library, Harvard University, Cambridge, MA, <http://id.lib.harvard.edu/alma/990080944970203941/catalog>. (Note that even though the preface to *Jinling tuyong* is dated 1623, the publication date should be 1624 because Zhu Zhifan's preface to *Jinling gujin tukao* is dated 1624 and includes his rationale for publishing these works together.) Photo: Imaging Department © President and Fellows of Harvard College.

explicit in his last entry: a lengthy reflection on the Hall of Great Foundations that also serves as a rationalization of the entire work. After briefly listing the various gates in the city walls, Yu turns his attention to the hall, which he clearly views as symbolic of the unfulfilled promise of the early Ming:

During the eleventh month of the first year of the Hongwu reign [1368], a Hall of Great Foundations was rebuilt within the palace walls, and learned officials were selected to instruct the crown prince and the various other descendant princes, dukes, and marquises in their studies here. Alas! After the establishment of Great Foundations, propitious fortune extended for over two hundred and seventy years. At peace and with a flourishing culture, the empire within the seas was a worthy heir to the Zhou and the Han, a deserving successor to the Tang and the Song. By contrast, those who founded states during the Six Dynasties period had no far-reaching aims, and their successors had only short-term objectives, esteeming pomp and splendor, while eschewing merit and virtue. Could they have been any more different [from the Ming]?

Nowadays, millet grows in the grounds of the former palaces, and those who wish to contemplate the ancient sites 弔古之士 pass through the ruins, a misty wasteland of white dew, with squirrels amid the thorns and brambles, and all let out the same long and mournful sighs. The incomplete conquests (*pian'an* 偏安 [lit. partial pacifications]) of the [Six Dynasties] rulers should never be mentioned in the same breath [as the Ming dynasty], but to separate the moral from the insidious, to choose between splendor and substance, requires someone able to distinguish between them 必有能辨者. This has been my principal objective in surveying the ancient sites. (pp. 57a–b)⁸⁰

The distinction Yu makes here at the very end of his long survey—between the virtuous Great Ming and those shorter-lived states of the Six Dynasties period that merely “esteemed pomp and splendor”—is fundamental to Yu’s entire project. Here, he finally makes explicit the subtle process of recasting Nanjing as the center of Ming culture that has been the implicit aim of all his preceding entries. How, he asks in his corresponding poem, “can such ostentatious Six Dynasties sites/ Compare to the Hall of Great Foundations of those [early

⁸⁰ For an alternative interpretation of this passage, see Jonathan Hay, *Shitao: Painting and Modernity in Early Qing China* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), p. 137.

Ming] days?" (p. 58a). For Yu, the vaguely imagined, decadent splendor of the Six Dynasties period is a fine topic for poets, but the Great Ming embodies a different moral order and demands to be taken seriously by historians. This is the role to which he has appointed himself and through which he can make sense of the threat to his own identity brought about by the fall of the Ming.

Generational Shift

If the primary objective of Yu Binshuo's survey is to designate key Ming landmarks as the principal historical sites of the city of Nanjing, that objective also implicitly consigns the Ming to the historical past in a way that distinguishes his account from many of the written and visual sources of his father's generation—some of whom would continue to live (in literary terms) in the pre-1644 worlds of their imaginations for at least another decade. Here, we can see the temporal dislocation that attended the fall of the Ming at its sharpest; as Philip Kafalas observes of Zhang Dai 張岱 (1597–ca. 1684): "his recollections attempt a recovery of, or perhaps a return to, an inhabitable past where, in some submerged sense, he has always lived."⁸¹ Jonathan Hay similarly calls attention to the insistence of a number of early Qing artists on an imaginative restoration "to something of its former Ming wholeness" of the pine forest that once surrounded Xiaoling 孝陵, the final resting place of the Hongwu emperor on Bell Mountain (Zhongshan 鍾山) and therefore the locus of nostalgia for generations of Ming loyalists following 1644.⁸² For Hay, such paintings are

divided, between resignation to the fact of the Ming past's pastness and a refusal to accept this pastness as a fact, for the paintings can also be interpreted as a stubborn, utopian attempt to keep the Ming alive in the imagination, and thus to keep history open.⁸³

These paintings too must be understood as discursive adaptations to cultural trauma in Piotr Sztompka's sense, but they are adaptations

⁸¹ Philip A. Kafalas, *In Limpid Dream: Nostalgia and Zhang Dai's Reminiscences of the Ming* (Norwalk, CT: EastBridge, 2007), p. 176.

⁸² Jonathan Hay, "Ming Palace and Tomb in Early Qing Jiangnan: Dynastic Memory and the Openness of History," *Late Imperial China* 20.1 (1999): 38.

⁸³ Hay, "Ming Palace and Tomb," pp. 39–40.

that are very different to those of Yu Binshuo.⁸⁴ Indeed, the verifiable *absence* of the pines in the early Qing landscape functions as a potent symbol of dynastic loss throughout the *Jinling langu*. That these trees were felled “after the removal of the sacrificial vessels” (*dingge hou* 鼎革後), that is, after the change in dynasty, underscores for Yu the wound that the Qing conquest represented to Chinese cultural heritage (p. 4b). At one point along the tour, Yu catches a glimpse of Xiaoling through the mist and “recalls” (*huixiang* 回想) that in “flourishing times” (*quansheng zhi shi* 全盛之時) the trees thrived (p. 6a). This inherited recollection suggests that the landscape of Xiaoling became a site “where memory crystallizes and secretes itself”—the repository of a politically charged image that mediates Yu’s experience.⁸⁵ The inherent artificiality of that experience is suggested by the written evidence showing that the disappearance of the pines at Bell Mountain had begun several years prior to the Manchu conquest.⁸⁶

Elsewhere, too, Yu’s descriptions of key Ming landmarks almost seem to overplay their ruined state. At the Spirit Music Temple (Shenyueguan 神樂觀), which was built beside the Altar to Heaven and Earth (Jiaotan 郊壇) and where tourists once flocked to see the prunus (*mei* 梅) blossoms in bloom, Yu finds just an abandoned temple and a few dead flowers—a far cry indeed from the “flourishing of former times” (*xiangshi zhi sheng* 曩時之盛; p. 3a). Yet it was whole enough for its repurposing as a temporary residence for the Kangxi emperor and already completed by 1668, according to the *Jiangning fuzhi* 江寧府志 (Prefectural gazetteer of Jiangning) of that year.⁸⁷

Yu Binshuo’s personal vision of Nanjing also very clearly contrasts with the vision presented in his father’s 1656 “Yonghuai guji” 詠懷古跡 (Laments on traces of ancient sites). Based on the date of this text’s composition, its subject matter, and its similar structure of prose introducing poetry for each site, it seems reasonable to suggest that it must have provided a model for the *Jinling langu* on some level at least. For example, Yu Huai’s preface—like Binshuo’s preface—explains the

⁸⁴ Sztompka, “Cultural Trauma,” p. 461.

⁸⁵ Pierre Nora, “Between Memory and History: *Les Lieux de Mémoire*,” *Representations* 26 (1989): 7.

⁸⁶ *Ming Xiaoling zhi* 明孝陵志, comp. Wang Huanbiao 王煥鑣, 7 *juan* (Taipei: Wenhai chubanshe, 1971), j. 5, pp. 68a–69a.

⁸⁷ Stuer, “Dimensions of Place,” p. 272.

need for this work by the fact that although the charm of Nanjing's hills and streams is unsurpassed, "since the calamity (*sangluan* 喪亂), much of it has been surrendered to the weeds."⁸⁸ Yet if anything stands out about Yu Huai's work, it is the very *absence* of the Ming dynasty from the urban space of Nanjing; moreover, its appended prose record of Bell Mountain does not mention the Ming at all.⁸⁹ It is significant that the subject of both Yu Huai's and Yu Binshuo's records is Jinling—the Nanjing of the past—and yet that past is interpreted very differently by the two men. Binshuo's title, "Jinling langu" is a conscious echo of an old literary model: it dates back at least as far as the *Jinling langu shi* 金陵覽古詩 (Poetical survey of the ancient sites of Jinling) by the Southern Tang poet Zhu Cun 朱存 (fl. tenth century). But unlike his father, Binshuo also uses the term "ancient" (*gu*) to attribute to his surveyed Ming landmarks a historical pastness that underscores the perspective of the second-generation remnant subject. My own rendering of *gu* as "ancient sites" perhaps also oversimplifies the combined temporal and "morally ennobling" category often implied by this term, as Craig Clunas shows in a different context.⁹⁰

Somewhat counterintuitively, Yu's vision of Nanjing was shared by the Kangxi emperor, who recorded his observations of the city on the occasion of his first visit in 1684. In his essay, Kangxi employs the same rhetorical move as Yu, stressing the moral superiority of the Ming when compared to the "partially pacifying" (*pian'an*) Six Dynasties states, which had been "unable even to defend themselves, exposing [the city] to the disorder of repeated succession."⁹¹ Alluding to Li Bai's famous poem, the emperor unambiguously places the former Ming palace in the same historical past as the flower- and weed-covered palaces of Wu and the buried hats and robes of the Eastern Jin.⁹²

Given their very different motivations, the similarity of language and imagery in the two accounts is initially startling. Yet there is a certain logic here. Kangxi repeatedly sought to tie the cultural and political

⁸⁸ Yu Huai, "Yonghuai guji," in *Yu Huai quanji*, v. 1, p. 127.

⁸⁹ Yu Huai, "Zhongshan jilue" 鐘山紀略, in *Yu Huai quanji*, v. 1, pp. 136–38.

⁹⁰ Clunas, *Superfluous Things*, pp. 80–81.

⁹¹ Shengzu Renhuangdi 聖祖仁皇帝 [the Kangxi emperor], "Guo Jinling lun" 過金陵論, in *Jiangnan tongzhi*, j. 22, pp. 10a–11b.

⁹² Shengzu Renhuangdi, "Guo Jinling lun," p. 11a; Hay, "Ming Palace and Tomb," p. 19. The allusion is to Li Bai's "Deng Jinling Fenghuangtai" 登金陵鳳凰臺, which is in *Li Taibai quanji*, v. 2, j. 21, p. 986.

legitimacy of Qing rule to his own inheritance of the Hongwu emperor's moral foundations, and he conspicuously praised the Hongwu reign as "governance that surpassed [even] the Tang and Song" (*zhi long Tang Song* 治隆唐宋), in the words of a stele he had erected in 1699.⁹³ Thus, in an essay undoubtedly designed to appeal to a disaffected Jiangnan elite, the emperor records that in the early Ming, "Nanjing's terraces and halls, its gardens and parks, and the flourishing of its arts meant that north and south rivaled each other, and Nanjing far surpassed [itself under] the Six Dynasties."⁹⁴ Kangxi explains that only following the extravagance and neglect of later emperors did the Ming slip into decline and lose its moral and political legitimacy. Such an argument was already widely accepted by early Qing historians: for Tang Zhen 唐甄 (1630–1704), for example, one had only to compare the simplicity of the Ming founder's plain cloth (*bu* 布) garments with those of his successors to understand the moral decline that had taken place.⁹⁵ Although both Yu Binshuo and the Kangxi emperor insist on the lingering existence of the Ming in Nanjing, they do so in a fashion that also steps "to the very edge of the interdynastic experience" because it emphasizes the Ming as having passed into history.⁹⁶

Concluding Reflections

The extended transition from Ming to Qing was a process that had profound implications for the cultural history of early modern East Asia, and Yu Binshuo was just one among many who participated in the "memory struggle" that followed. Chikamatsu Monzaemon's 近松門左衛門 puppet play *Kokusen'ya kassen* 国性爺合戦 (The battles of Koxinga [Zheng Chenggong]), first performed in 1715, is the best known of several examples that symbolically preserve Ming time and space on the Japanese stage. The sight of Korean officials in Ming-style hats and robes is reputed to have brought tears to the eyes of mid-seventeenth-century Chinese observers, yet by 1765, a member of a Korean embassy

⁹³ *Ming Xiaoling zhi*, j. 5, p. 70a.

⁹⁴ Shengzu Renhuangdi, "Guo Jinling lun," p. 11b.

⁹⁵ Tang Zhen, *Qian shu* 潛書, 2 *juan* (each in 2 parts) (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1963), j. 2A, p. 107.

⁹⁶ Hay, "Suspension of Dynastic Time," pp. 196–97.

Hong Dae-yong 洪大容 (1731–1783) considered himself and his colleagues, who continued to wear such attire, as the guardians of Chinese cultural heritage, describing bemused onlookers in Beijing as having “forgotten their roots” (*wang ben* 忘本).⁹⁷ It would surely be an over-determined use of the term to claim that Hong was “traumatized” by the collapse of the Ming, one hundred and twenty years after the fall of Beijing. A more subtle reading, however, might identify anxieties about changes to collective cultural identity—and about an uncertain relationship between cultural heritage and the self in the context of a new world order—as precisely those characteristics of inherited cultural trauma that I argue are key components of the extended Ming–Qing transition.

They are, moreover, precisely the anxieties that lie at the heart of Yu Binshuo's survey. The experiences of these men are not comparable to those of the men and women on whom were inflicted the violence, grief, degradation, and death that attended the military conquests of 1644 and subsequent years. Yet their anxieties and their experiences—differently traumatic, but traumatic nonetheless—are valuable windows into the complex post-Ming world, in which collective identities were reconsidered and renegotiated by a range of actors, well beyond the seventeenth century and well beyond the city walls of Nanjing.

Historical and literary treatments of Nanjing produced during the remainder of the Qing period continue to allude to Six Dynasties referents, although as Tobie Meyer-Fong shows in the case of early Qing Yangzhou, historical locations that were associated with the city's decadent past attracted a significant new layer of symbolic meaning after 1645.⁹⁸ For Wu Weiye 吳偉業 (1609–1672), drawing on Liu Yuxi's 劉禹錫 (772–842) evocative description, the last days of the kingdom of Wu provided a natural metaphor for the fall of the Ming. Still later, following the Qing conquest of Taiping-held Nanjing in 1864, yet another new layer of meaning was overlaid onto the landscape, and thus a poem by Zhu Kebao 諸可寶 (1845–1903) can lament the recent sacking of the city with a direct reference to the fall of the Ming, while alluding to famous poems of the Tang and Song, creating “a concise history of Chinese poetry from the Tang through the Qing,” in Stephen Owen's

⁹⁷ Ge Zhaoguang 葛兆光, “Da Ming yiguan jin he zai?” 大明衣冠今何在, *Shixue yuekan* 史学月刊, no. 10 (2005): 41–48.

⁹⁸ Meyer-Fong, *Building Culture*.

analysis.⁹⁹ Such temporal blurring is, I believe, precisely what Yu Binshuo was trying to prevent in the *Jinling langu*. To his mind, the analogy between Ming Nanjing and the city's more poetic past was a false one, and clear distinctions between the moral substance of the Ming and the flashy splendor of previous ages should be carefully maintained.

But Nanjing continued to be a city of multiple interpretative possibilities throughout the Qing, and not everyone experienced its sites and sights the same way. As Chuck Wooldridge shows, the Tongcheng scholar-official Yao Nai 姚鼐 (1731–1815) and his circle chose to preserve certain Ming landmarks in their representations of the city, in part as a way of reasserting the power of local literati to define and create Nanjing's distinctive urban space. For Yao and others, virtues such as loyalty were embedded in particular sites, such as the shrine of Fang Xiaoru, which Yu Binshuo had been at pains to document over a century before.¹⁰⁰

And of course, the urban space of Nanjing continues to be rewritten. Today, the ever-expanding metro system—perhaps the modern equivalent of the traveler's itinerary prescribed by Yu Binshuo—superimposes new layers of meaning onto the city, some of which contain significant Ming content. The station “Three Mountains Street” (San-shan jie 三山街), for example, refers to an important location in the cultural history of Ming Nanjing, but one that has no physical presence for the twenty-first-century visitor.¹⁰¹ Such temporal blurring suggests that the identity of this remarkable city will surely be reimaged and reinvented in complex ways for many years to come.

⁹⁹ Owen, “Place,” p. 452 (romanization altered).

¹⁰⁰ Chuck Wooldridge, *City of Virtues: Nanjing in an Age of Utopian Visions* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2015), pp. 78–87.

¹⁰¹ Lucille Chia, “Of Three Mountains Street: The Commercial Publishers of Ming Nanjing,” in *Printing and Book Culture in Late Imperial China*, ed. Cynthia J. Brokaw and Kai-Wing Chow (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2005), pp. 107–51.